

Dear Co-Chair Winfield, Co-Chair Stafstrom and members of the Judiciary Committee:

Please vote NO on S.B. 16 (AN ACT ADDRESSING GUN VIOLENCE AND JUVENILE CRIME)

Please vote NO on H.B. 5416 (AN ACT CONCERNING BULK PURCHASES OF PISTOLS AND REVOLVERS)

Please vote YES on S.B. No. 388 (AN ACT CONCERNING THE DEFENSE OF A PERSON OR A PERSON'S DWELLING, PLACE OF WORK OR MOTOR VEHICLE)

Please vote YES on H.B. No. 5415 (AN ACT CONCERNING THE TRANSFER OF ASSAULT WEAPONS AND LARGE CAPACITY MAGAZINES)

Please vote YES on H.B. No. 5412 (AN ACT CONCERNING THE DUTY TO RETREAT IN A RELIGIOUS HOUSE OF WORSHIP)

With regard to S.B. 16:

- Expands the list of banned firearms:
 - Ban on “other” firearms. **This is a bad idea**. Any firearm that is in **common use** for self defense must be made available for law-abiding pistol permit holders in our state to be utilized for their own self-defense. Section 15 of Article One of the Connecticut Constitution provides that “Every citizen has a right to **bear arms in defense of himself** and the state.” Please do not infringe further on the rights of law-abiding, pistol permit holding Connecticut citizens to defend themselves anymore than the current Connecticut Assault Weapons Ban already does.
 - Ban on pistol braces and stabilizing braces. **This is a bad idea**. Pistol stabilizing braces allow people with physical handicaps to aim and shoot their weapon with increased safety and accuracy. This also help people without physical handicaps to do the same.
 - Ban on the sale of receivers/lowers. **This is a bad idea**. Receiver/lowers are merely parts to firearms that should be allowed to remain legal for law-abiding pistol permit holders in our state to possess.
 - Ban on .22 rimfire rifles with detachable magazine and ONE feature. **This is a bad idea**. These are firearms that shoot rounds that are not center-fired and therefore were purposefully never intended to be included in the original state and federal Assault Weapons Ban of 1994 and any subsequent ban. These are target shooting and varmint hunting firearms, and not the sort usually associated with criminal activity.
 - Ban on Pre-Ban (1994) semi-automatic rifles. **This is a bad idea**. These were intended to be exempt from the original state and federal Assault Weapons Ban of 1994 and any subsequent ban. The reason why is because it was understood that several law-abiding citizens were possession of these firearms and should be able to continue to buy, sell and possess these firearms as they were able to before the original Assault Weapons Ban.
 - Ban all transfers and sales of 2022 assault weapon within the state. **This is a very, very bad idea**. It is unfair that only those that possess one of the newly proposed banned firearms before a certain date should be able to possess them after that date. Taking away the people's abilities to buy and sell private property is an unconstitutional removal of their rights to participate in commerce. As long

as the property being bought or sold is being exchanged between law-abiding and properly credentialed parties (e.g., pistol permit holders that can pass background check), then the State of Connecticut has no business in blocking that transaction.

- New gun registration requirements:
 - Required to obtain a certificate of possession. **This is a bad idea**. Firearm transfers already require authorization that includes a background check and the requirement to receive a unique identifying number from the Connecticut State Police Department. Please do not add an additional permitting requirement to an already onerous process.
- Modification to firearm carry laws:
 - Police should only be able to request identification if there is a reasonable suspicion of illegal activity, and that includes someone's pistol permit. It is an affront to the Fourth Amendment jurisprudence regarding illegal searches and seizures for police to be able to **request a pistol permit without their being a reasonable suspicion of a crime**. This is what is known as a "Stop and Frisk" law, and such tactics were struck down in New York City. If enacted in our state, they will be struck down here too. Please stop this proposed infringement on our individual civil liberties and **please stop the treatment of law-abiding pistol permit owners as second class citizens**.
 - The creation of additional **gun free zones is a very, very bad idea**. The concept of gun free zones does not protect anyone, and in fact, makes those areas more dangerous. There has never been a gun free zone warning sign that has prevented a criminal from using a gun in a gun free zone. There are, however, cases where a gun free zone sign has dissuaded law-abiding gun owners from carrying a legally possessed firearm into such a gun free zone and then, as a result, suffering the consequences of not being able to defend themselves as an armed criminal causes harm to them and others. Please do not force law-abiding citizens to not be able to protect themselves. **We should not be made to feel unsafe. Please do not create new gun free zones** in the following places:
 - within 75 feet of any polling place
 - in any municipal or state building
 - on any bus, train or ferry operated by a government entity
 - within 250 feet of at any demonstration in a public place

With regard to H.B. 5416, please **do not further infringe on our U.S. and State Constitutional rights to self-defense**. There is no evidence that restricting the sale and purchase of firearms to law-abiding pistol permit holders has any effect on gun-related crime. And **in no way would the purchase of two of anything in a month's time be considered a "bulk purchase"**. This is a needless restriction with no reasonable basis for its existence. Please vote no on H.B. 5416.

With regard to S.B. No. 388, please codify our rights to defend ourselves in our homes, places of work and **in our cars**. It should not be the law of the land that people who reasonably feel their lives and the lives of others are unlawfully being threatened should not be able to use reasonable physical force to defend themselves and defend others.

With regard to H.B. No. 5412, please codify our rights to defend ourselves in our **places of worship**. It should not be the law of the land that people who reasonably feel their lives and the lives of others are unlawfully being threatened should not be able to use reasonable physical force to defend themselves and defend others.

Please stop making law-abiding citizens into future potential criminals by criminalizing activity that is lawful today. Rather, please focus your efforts on fully prosecuting compliance with the multitude of gun laws that are currently on the books now.

Best regards,

Alfred J. Kritzman
38 Fulton Place
West Hartford, CT 06107
Email: ajkritzman@yahoo.com